

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,114	01/08/2001	Geoffrey A Wilkin	PM 276508 2749BRCK	5351

09 7590

01/15/2003

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102

EX	AMINER	
CUEVA	S, PEDRO J	
ARTUNIT	PAPER NUMBER	

2834 DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s) WILKIN, GEOFFREY A	
Advisory Action	09/755,114	WILKIN, GEOFFF		
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Pedro J. Cuevas	2834		
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ac	ldress	
THE REPLY FILED 28 October 2002 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Aptendition (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this c: (1) a timely filed amendme peal (with appeal fee); or (3)	s application. A proper re ent which places the applic ) a timely filed Request for	ply to a cation in	
	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]		
a) ☐ The period for reply expires months from the n b) ☑ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ex ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07ff).	this Advisory Action, or (2) the date pire later than SIX MONTHS from t	the mailing date of the final reje	ction.	
tex harsions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the file fee under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration dat (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	riod of extension and the correspon te of the shortened statutory period Office later than three months after	iding amount of the fee. The ap for reply originally set in the fin	propriate extension al Office action: or	
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella     The Appella of CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37).				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entere	d because:			
(a) They raise new issues that would require fu	urther consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below)	;	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	te below);			
<ul> <li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application</li> <li>issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	on in better form for appeal l	by materially reducing or s	simplifying the	
<ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without car</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>	nceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected clair	ms.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	jection(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo	ould be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely file	d amendment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:		en considered but does N	OT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SC	DLELY to issues which we	ere newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims			and an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:			
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: 11-20.				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐	disapproved by the Exan	niner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ment(s)( PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)		
10 Char				

NESTOR RAMIREZ SUPETIVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CONTER 2800

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented by the applicants representative in the amendment filled on October 28, 2002 are not considered persuasive because although there are some differences between the claimed invention and the prior art, those differences are not included in the present finally rejected claims. As an example, must be noted that independent claim 11 only requires insilation between the bolt and the rotor discs.